"Non-Intervention"

Sir: In your editorial of June 5 con-cerning Haltl you write this sentence: "It is all very unsatisfactory, and most of all this episode points to the limits of our formal policy of noninterven-tion." The policy that you mention is very "formal" because it is a "front." The effective, active policy is one of direct intervention. Sending in the Marines was a part of an out-dated and much more naïve operation. Today the United States furnishes money and the know-how and the local governments with United States armed forces' assistance develop their own "marines" to police the status quo.

From 1946 to 1961 the United States gave Latin American countries \$500 millions of direct military subsidy, and also much indirect aid through the CKA and other agencies which can't be checked. During this period \$1.5 billion was given in other grants and loans and United States business had \$9 billion invested.

At present the United States has 60 military training teams in fifteen Latin American countries, including Haiti. The United States Caribbean Command, with headquarters at Fort Gulick in the Canal Zone, is training key personnel in large numbers from eighteen Latin American countries. The United States Army operates the Inter-American Defense College, at Fort Lesley J. McNair, for the training of Latin American officers. It is no secret that this training is oriented toward "counter-insurgency and internal policing," rather than hemisphere defense, which was the original reason given for these huge military commitments which began during World War II.

This modern intervention, which hides behind the sanctimonious non-intervention policy, indicates that the Alliance for Progress is a manifestation of either schizophrenia or fraud.

Ben Everinghim.

Baltimore, June 5.